

### REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended to recite subject matter from now-canceled claims 10 and 11, as well as to recite that the input sections of the main conveyor are spaced from one another along the main conveyor.

It is submitted that there is no motivation in the cited prior art for combining Clark et al., DeBurgh, and Hale et al. which would be necessary in order to reject a claim that includes the recitations of claims 7, 10 and 11. Also, even though Clark et al. discloses a main conveyor ("common conveyor") having an input section ("merging point") for receiving items, the merging point is common to the conveyors 1 and 3 and does not constitute input sections that are spaced apart along a direction of travel of the main conveyor, as recited in claim 7. In fact, the entire thrust of the Clark et al. patent is the provision of a collision prevention system necessitated by the fact that the main conveyor has a common input section for receiving items.


Furthermore, claim 7 recites the presence of reversing apparatuses each disposed adjacent the main conveyor at a location downstream of selected ones of the pallet carriers. That is because not all of the pallets need be reversed; only the pallets from some of the pallet carriers. In Hale et al. all of the pallet carriers are reversed; there is only one reversing apparatus. Hale et al. does not disclose a plurality of reversing apparatus disposed downstream of selected ones of the pallet carriers.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: July 19, 2004

By:   
Alan E. Kopecki  
Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620